

## Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended. Claims 6, 12 and 18-46 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1-5, 8-11 and 13-17 are pending.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-17, 19-25, 27-35, 37-44 and 46 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,681,109 issued to Leifer (*Leifer*) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0022488 of Srinivasan, et al. (*Srinivasan*). Claims 19-25, 27-35, 37-44 and 46 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 19-25, 27-35, 37-44 and 46 is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1-5, 8-11 and 13-17 are not rendered obvious by *Leifer* and *Srinivasan*.

Claim 1 recites:

generating service availability information corresponding to at least an estimated time until the requested services are available in response to receiving the customer information wherein the service availability information comprises one or more of an estimated wait time, a distance between the service establishment and the wireless device, a service status, a location of the service establishment and a location of the wireless device;

monitoring the distance between the service establishment and the wireless device to determine whether an estimated travel time over the distance exceeds the estimated wait time; and

providing, to a wireless service provider that provides wireless services to the customer-provided wireless device, the service availability information including providing a notification via the wireless device when the estimated travel time exceeds the estimated wait time.

Thus, Applicants claim generating various types of service availability information including determining when an estimated travel time between the location of the wireless device and the service establishment exceeds the wait time. Claims 7 and 13 recite similar limitations.

Applicants agree with the Office Action that *Leifer* does not disclose service availability information or tracking the location of the wireless device. See pages 3-4. While *Srinivasan* discloses determining a location of a wireless device, *Srinivasan* does not provide determining when an estimated travel time between the location of the wireless device and the service establishment exceeds the wait time. Because neither *Leifer* nor *Srinivasan* discloses generating various types of service availability information including determining when an estimated travel time between the location of the wireless device and the service establishment exceeds the wait time, no combination of *Leifer* and *Srinivasan* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1, 7 and 13.

The remaining claims are dependent claims that depend from the independent claims discussed above. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that the dependent claims are not rendered obvious by *Leifer* and *Srinivasan* for at least the reasons set forth above.

#### CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-5, 8-11 and 13-17 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the

undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP**

Date: March 3, 2008

/Paul A. Mendonsa/  
Paul A. Mendonsa  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 439-8778